

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The final Office Action dated September 29, 2004 has been received and its content carefully reviewed. Applicant kindly requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-10, 12, 14-25 and 28-29 are pending in the application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-10, 15, 20-21, 23-25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Application No. JP403228025, issued to Jingu et al. (hereafter “Jingu”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,380,479, issued to Nakai et al. (hereafter “Nakai”) and Japanese Application No. JP401313520, issued to Kimura (hereafter “Kimura”). Claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-10, 14-15, 20-21, 23-25 and 29 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Application No. JP407199165, issued to Aoki et al. (hereafter “Aoki”) in view of Nakai and Kimura. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections because neither Jingu, Nakai, Kimura nor Aoki, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Jingu, Nakai, Kimura and Aoki fail to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display (LCD) device including, among other features, “passivation layers on outer surfaces of the first and second substrates” as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application.

Applicant notes the Examiner has incorrectly equated the moisture-proof films 7 and 8 of Jingu to the passivation layers recited in the present application. As illustrated in FIG. 1 of Jingu, the moisture-proof films 7 and 8 surround polarizing plates 5 and 6 in order to prevent damage to the structure under high temperature and humidity environments. As such, Jingu fails to teach the structure of the LCD device including the “passivation layers on outer surfaces of the first and second substrates” recited in independent claim 1 of the present application.

To remedy the deficient teachings of Jingu, the Office Action relies upon the teachings of Nakai and Kimura. Applicant submits neither Nakai nor Kimura remedy the deficiencies of Jingu. Nakai discloses “a photovoltaic element which directly converts an optical energy such as solar light into an electric energy” (Abstract). And, Kimura discloses “depositing a benzocyclobutene derivative on a substrate” (Abstract). However, neither Nakai nor Kimura teach or suggest “passivation layers on outer surfaces of the first and second substrates” as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application.

The Office Action further relies upon the teachings of Aoki. However, Applicant notes Aoki discloses a substrate for a liquid crystal display element formed by “coating at least one surface of a transparent resin substrate with a transparent film 1 consisting of an inorganic oxide and consisting of this transparent film of the inorganic oxide of a hydrolyzed polycondensate of a metal alkoxide” (Constitution). Aoki does not teach “passivation layers on outer surfaces of the first and second substrates” as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application.

Based upon the above, no combination of Jingu, Nakai, Kimura and Aoki teaches or suggests the combined features recited in independent claim 1, and claim 1 and its dependent claim 2 is allowable over Jingu, Nakai, Kimura and Aoki.

Independent claim 5 is allowable over Jingu, Aoki, Nakai and Kimura because Jingu, Aoki, Nakai and Kimura fail to teach or suggest an LCD device including, “passivation layers on outer surfaces of the first and second etched substrates.” As discussed above, none of the references teaches “passivation layers on outer surfaces of first and second substrates”. Further, none of the references teaches “passivation layers on outer surfaces of the first and second etched substrates” (emphasis added) as recited in independent claim 5. Because Aoki, Jingu, Nakai and Kimura fail to teach or suggest the combined features of claim 5, claim 5 and its dependent claim 6 is allowable over any combination of Aoki, Jingu, Nakai and Kimura.

Claim 9 is allowable over Jingu, Aoki, Nakai and Kimura because neither Jingu, Aoki, Nakai or Kimura, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests a method for manufacturing an LCD device that includes, among other features, “forming passivation layers on an entire outer surface of the first and second substrates.” Because Jingu, Aoki, Nakai and Kimura fail to teach or suggest a method having this combined feature, claim 9 and its dependent claims 10, 12, and 14-23 are allowable over any combination of Jingu, Aoki, Nakai and Kimura.

Claim 24 is allowable over Jingu, Aoki, Nakai and Kimura because Jingu, Aoki, Nakai and Kimura fail to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display (LCD) that includes, among other features, “passivation layers on outer surfaces of the first and second substrates.” Because no combination of Jingu, Aoki, Nakai and Kimura, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests at least the combined features of claim 24, claim 24 and its dependent claims 25 and 28-29 are allowable over Jingu, Aoki, Nakai, and Kimura.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-10, 12, 14-15, 20-21, 23-25 and 29 are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, dependent claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jingu in view of Nakai and Kimura and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,150,430, issued to Walters et al. (hereafter "Walters"); dependent claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jingu in view of Nakai and Kimura and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,733,177, issued to Tsuchlya et al. (hereafter "Tsuchlya"); claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jingu in view of Nakai and Kimura, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 20020079289; and claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jingu in view of Nakai and Kimura. Applicant traverse the rejections first because the present application (Application Serial No. 10/025,765) and Doh were, at the time of the invention of the present application, made and owned by LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. Therefore, Doh is not available as prior art against the claims of the present application.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections because neither Walters nor Tsuchlya, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. Specifically, Walters and Tsuchlya fail to provide any teaching or suggestion that would remedy the deficient teachings of Jingu, Nakai and Kimura, nor provide motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Jingu to obtain a liquid crystal display device and method of manufacturing a LCD device having the combined features recited in independent claims 9 and 24. By virtue of their dependence from independent claims 9 and 24, dependent claims 12, 16-22 and 28 also contain the allowable features recited in claims 9 and 24. Accordingly, dependent claims 12, 16-22 and 28 are allowable over any combination of Jingu, Nakai, Kimura, Walters and Tsuchlya. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

Application No.: 10/025,765
Amendment dated December 29, 2004
Reply to final Office Action dated September 29, 2004

Docket No.: 8733.514.00-US

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: December 29, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie Hayes
Valerie Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant